

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Australian Provisional Application No. PR 2564, not previously submitted is now enclosed.

Claims 1 and 4 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Trane (USPN 6,219,227). Claims 2 and 3 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trane in view of Silverbrook (USPN 5,815,179).

Present claim 1 defines a hand held personal digital assistant having an in-built printer.

Trane teaches a portable computer having connecting ports for receiving a cellular telephone and printer. The general language is that the printer is “securable” or “releasably securable” to the main outer casing through the connector 78.

From a reading of the specification as a whole, in particular when considering the drawings, it would be apparent to the skilled addressee that the portable computer taught by Trane is of a size that would normally be referred to as a lap-top or notebook computer. Accordingly, Trane fails to teach the limitation in claim 1 that the device is a hand held device.

The Trane device as taught by the preferred embodiments would not overcome the problems solved by the present invention, namely ready and convenient printing by virtue of an in-built printer. The Trane device would require the user to carry the printer device at all times with the computer in case printing was desired. When printing was required the user would be required to connect the printer to the computer through the connector 78. Accordingly, these embodiments fail to teach the invention defined by present claim 1 because the printer is not “in-built” to the device.

Trane does describe at column 7 lines 45 to 57 that the printer device can be made integrated into the outer casing 34. There is however only detailed disclosure of a detachable form of the printer 18. No enabling disclosure of how the printer would be in-

built to the casing is provided by Trane. It could therefore only be inferred that in order to incorporate the printer into the casing, the casing would be extended to surround the printer device 18. Therefore, embodiments where the printer is in-built to the device as is required to anticipate present claim 1, would be of increased dimension and would therefore not fall within the scope of hand held presently defined in claim 1.

For these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 contains limitations not taught by Trane and therefore claim 1 is novel in light of Trane.

Claims 2 to 4 are each dependent on claim 1 and therefore, by extension of the arguments presented above, Applicant submits that claims 2 to 4 are novel in light of Trane.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in respect of claims 5 to 9. Claim 5 has been re-drafted in independent form and includes all the limitations of claim 1 on which it was previously dependent.

By amendment and the comments made herein, Applicant has addressed all issues raised in the Official Action. Favourable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



KIA SILVERBROOK



TOBIN ALLEN KING

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762